

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
(510) 286-4444
TDD (510) 286-4454



March 8, 1999

Mr. Steve Heminger
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

Marj -
For your file
-S

Dear Mr. Heminger:

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

Attached for your use is a copy of the transcript of the January 13, 1999 Bay Bridge Design Task Force meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact Steve Hulsebus, Supervising Transportation Engineer at (510) 286-5085 (e-mail address shulsebu@dot.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
DISTRICT DIRECTOR

by

STEVEN L. HULSEBUS
Supervising Transportation Engineer
SFOBB East Span

Attachment

Cal-Trans Bay Bridge Task Force

Susan Gard

Several important events have occurred since the last meeting in October. One: the public comment period on CalTrans draft environmental impact statement on the new eastern strand ended in November and CalTrans announced in late December and it has identified the single **inaudible** suspension design and the northern alignment both recommended by MTC as the preferred alternative for the new span. We will hear a report from Dennis Mulligan of CalTrans on this decision and an update on current geo-technical work CalTrans has performed on the alignment. Secondly, as you all know there are major changes taking place in Sacramento. There is a new Director of CalTrans, former Supervisor Jose Medenas of San Francisco, who we are delighted about since he will clearly represent the interest of our regions. And a new secretary of Business Housing and Transportation Ms. Maria Contreras-Sweet who obviously will represent the entire state even though she comes from Southern California I'm sure that Mr. Madena will keep her on her toes in regard to our interests. And of course our new Governor Gray Davis. While there's considerable speculation on what these changes will mean to the bridge design I can tell you at this point there has been no official communication from the new administration which MTC is now working to set up a meeting with Director Medena to brief him on the background and rationale for the recommended design and alignment of the new span. I would like to point out also that in 1997 the legislature and the Governor passed a law that gave MTC a job to do. That was to recommend a bridge design on behalf of the Bay Area. We carried out that job to the best of our ability and completed it in June of 1998. That same law ensured funding for the new eastern span and the retrofit of five other state owned toll-bridges on financial terms that were quite

favorable to our region. Unless and until that law changes we can only expect that Cal Trans will proceed to complete the design and build the new Bay Bridge that MTC has recommended. A Third event since our last meeting was the passage in November of Ballot measures in four cities regarding rail service on the Bay Bridge. In early December MTC received a letter from the Mayors of the four cities regarding their ballot measures and we have responded. Copies of both letters are included in today's packet and also are available at the back table. We'll hear a report from Steve Hemminnger regarding MTC's proposed real study outline, as he's outlined and in the letter. I would also like to point out another piece of correspondence in our agenda packet of which there are copies on the back table. The CalTrans seismic Advisor Board, and esteemed panel of earthquake experts has written to the Bay Area Congressional Delegation regarding the Navy's refusal to allow CalTrans to do geo-technical soil testing on or near Yurba Buena (?) Island. The letter states, and I quote " The Seismic Advisor Board is very concerned with any delays long or short on such an important project to the citizens or economy of California. Such impediments undoubtedly will jeopardize public safety" In plain terms, very plain terms, that letter reminds us as this committee has sought to do for the last eighteen months, of what the new bridge is all about, namely public safety. With all the talk about design and alignment and added amenities we tend to forget that we are in fact racing to beat the clock to build a stronger, safer bridge that will withstand the next big earthquake which we know is coming. So we begin this meeting with a clear statement in that regard and hopefully those who are now responsible leaders at the state and local levels will join us in that sense of public safety responsibility. Now before we proceed with the agenda, I want to make request of CalTrans and the committee before I leave and that is that you make some commitment today with regards to the Bay Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisor Committees requests. Their concern is that, while there has been ongoing and long dialog and they are happy about that, there hasn't been a response and nothing specific has come up and they want to make sure that

anything that is going on will not preclude any potential pathway amenities that they are concerned about, so Dennis if you can respond....

Voice #2 **Inaudible** , Madam Chairman, CalTrans is committed to providing the information and resources necessary to the Bike/Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission so that you can make an informed decision with respect to Bike & Pedestrian access on the west span similar to what you did on the east span.

Voice #1 That's great and if the Bike people want to make comments or questions you can do so under item three on the agenda when there is an opportunity to do that. Now as I've made obviously, Hi Happy New Year, good to be joining by somebody to my right, **inaudible**, we are a little worried about third to the left..**inaudible**...I'm sorry..**inaudible**...before we proceed I certainly want to say Happy New Year to all my fellow **inaudible** and give the an opportunity to make any comments and to also to remind the audience that anyone who wished to speak should fill out one of the blue cards located at the back table and I will turn to my left, Mr. Shank., Oh I'm sorry Mr. Rubin you're leaning back...

Voice #3 John Rubin from **inaudible**, Mayor of San Francisco, I'm Tom Shay representing one of the supervisors of San Francisco I just want to mention a few things, first off I appreciate very much our chair, made a very broad summary, of what we have been doing, she identified some major factors before us such as the political changes in Sacramento and a few other things. But I do like to make a point of just attention. I think the measure passed by the four city in the last election certainly is something on our mind and I hope in some capacity this committee and CalTrans would continue to pursue in some kind of fashion to address the requests by the four cities in the future. One thing that happened to come in mind is that are things that this committee and CalTrans have to respond. That is there is a persistent objection by the United State Department of

the Navy on the usage of some of the properties and **inaudible** in the recent weeks or months I like to hear some response by CalTrans and the staff because after all they are the landlords for this important project at the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and without their support I think it is very doubtful that we will have a project and the second I think that there is something the city of San Francisco has been working on for sometime. I hope the city of San Francisco and the committee and the CalTrans will come to some kind of arrangement so the requests of considering the southern alignment by the city somehow can be addressed in a professional manner instead of continue to hear a lot of rumbling about what the cities requests is what kind of a stonewall from our staff is, which I hope is not true on the other hand these kind of professional issues should be resolved. Finally, I think to the credit of our chair and the members of the committee that we manage to move the project along the way that we have been mandated by the state and the MTC and I hope with all the best wishes to the chair and committee that we will end up with a project we can be proud of.

Voice #4 My name is Louise **inaudible** Siracuse I represent BCDC on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on this task force of I think it is fair to say, it is certainly my opinion and I believe that it has been ratified by the formal vote of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in its entirety that we have engaged in a technically supportable and politically open process and I think that those of us who engaged in it felt very comfortable that the advice that we were getting from CalTrans from the designers review and engineering reviews committees and from the public led us to a technically defensible position. I don't think that we should ever close the door on further study and further negotiation within the context of funding limits etc.etc. but I would be unalterably opposed to slowing down or stopping the design to revisit old issue that came to us before this is a seismic safety project I think the time is critical to us I think we've given the process as much openness and honesty as is necessary it was complete and I don't think we need to do anymore and while we may be

disputing some fundamental issues and even some cosmetic ones I'm confident that we have moved forward in the best possible way and ought not be quote "derailed" at this particular point.

Voice #5 I'm Sharon Brown from Contra Costa County cities representing on this group like my predecessors here and college we did have an extremely open and lengthy sessions. We discussed anything and everything for many many months. It was a totally open position. Not only, and we talk about the public safety issues, but I also want to hit a little bit on the economic liability of the Bay Area and we know what it was like for a short period of time when the Bay Bridge was down before and I think we're working against a timeclock and I would hate to see us go back and re-hash all those issues for more and more months to come just in case. Thank You.

Voice #6 Sorry you had to wake me up there Chair, I' Mark Casaone, I represent Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on MTC in this task force and along with Sharon we represent 35% I believe of the people who us the Bay Bride every morning and for those people who don't know, Contra Costa County is in the east bay Non of our constituencies or our cities have voted against the proposal and I think Sharon would agree most of our political and anecdotal comments to us have been to go forward as quickly as possible and it has been very positive. So I hope that we can work cooperatively with the realistic expectation that we have a job to do as **inaudible** has said we should proceed all collectively. Thank You.

Voice #1 Thank you and as we proceed with the job it is one that we'll be happy when were finished with. Now lets proceed with Item #1 on hear from Dennis Mulligan..Happy New Year Dennis....

Voice # 7 We last met on October 14th and we thought we would update you on activities since your last meeting just a reminder the east span is from the

Oakland shore to the Yurba Buena Island the west span is a separate project. I'll provide an update on the environmental issues Brian **inaudible** will update on the geology structure design and structure construction related issues. CalTrans released a draft environmental impact statement on September 24. The comment period closed on that draft 60 days later and during that period of time we held four public hearings throughout the Bay Area. We received for a project of this size a surprising small volume of comments and I think that's attributed to the process MTC went through early on over the last two years where there are thousands of comments, letters and dozens of meetings that were open to the public. Typically on a project of this size we would receive four or five hundred letters, we received eighty three. We received those comments from agencies and from the public. We have considered those comments and we identified a preferable alternative. As part of that process we have been going through what we call need before for process. That all the Federal Agencies have been with us each step of the way signing off on the alternatives, the purpose and need and on this criteria. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service, The United States EPA, National Marine Fisheries, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration have all signed off on this criteria. The second to bottom bullet here is to minimize impact to environmental resources. That is what the environmental process is about. It is to allow informed decisions to be made. Environmental document is an array of alternatives with the things that society values are disclosed in judged against that. For each bullet on this slide a technical study was prepared that's available in the library. Those technical studies were summarized in that environmental impact statement. Per the schedule we released sometime ago, while it was very aggressive we called for actually identifying the preferred alternative in November we slipped a couple of weeks on that and identified it in December and we have been ongoing with design, what we call risk design which you will see on the lower slide down here, we call it risk design because we started prior to the **inaudible** decision. We did that recognizing that under the NEEPA process with the **inaudible** we may have to slow down and start over again that buys us back a year and that's a year that

we can provide public safety to the public if we proceed on this course. With respect to the final environmental impact statement we can plan on having that in spring of 1999 with the **inaudible** in summer 1999. This is the alignment, and I'll pause here and talk for a moment, we have five alternatives in that draft, a no build, a retrofit, and three alignment alternatives. Bridge types were considered design variations among those. For orientation, this is Yurba Buena Island, it is a natural Island in San Francisco Bay. It is approximately 150 acres. It goes from sea level to an elevation of 350 feet. So it is a big knob of rock in the Bay. Treasure Island is 404 acres. Treasure Island is a man made island in the San Francisco Bay. With respect to stake holds and their position on alignments. The Coast Guard operates on the south side of the existing bridge. They're three functions of Yurba Buena Island. One they operate 24 hour a day search and rescue mission, this is a central bay location which allows them to reach where stranded mariners are. There are no speed or wake restrictions leaving this site. They also have a facility where they repair aids to navigation or buoys. At the top of the Island they have their vessel traffic service. They states in their written comments that they strongly prefer a northern alignment. The Navy owns Yurba Buena Island and the remainder of Treasure Island. The Navy gave us strong comments that a northern alignment would be unacceptable and they prefer a southern alignment. According to the base closure acts of 1993, the Navy is supposed to be closing this base which they have done and they are supposed to be transferring this land to the local entities and leaving this sight. They have no operating naval facility on Yurba Buena Island at this time. The city and county of San Francisco. The Navy also had concerns about historic properties on the island which we'll talk a little bit about. There are historic properties on both ends of the bridge. On the Oakland side and on the Yurba Buena Island side. The Navy has concerns also about turning the land over to San Francisco. San Francisco has concerns also because Yurba Buena Island is eminently more developable than Treasure Island. For two principal reasons, one is not man made fill so it won't sink into the bay in an earthquake so foundation costs would be less to build there. The other reason is that Treasure Island is subject to a

state Constitutional restriction called a title and stress act. That was re-affirmed in Senate Bill 699 which was signed approximately a year and a half ago into law. That bill states that the title and stress act bill does apply. For example San Francisco cannot build housing here though they could build luxury hotels. The difference between and southern and northern alignment in the ultimate final construction condition is approximately 6 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island. On the Oakland shore the Oakland Army base is closing so they are a stake holder. The Port of Oakland desires additional land from them and BCDC has approved sea port plan contemplates 220 acres of fill. To have a further port expansion in this area. The east bay regional park district contemplates getting 16 acres of land from the port as part of the closure. They would like to take that and combine it with Cal Trans land and build a large park on the Oakland shore. Both the port of Oakland and the East Bay regional park prefer a northern alignment. This thin gray line here which is hard to see just above the yellow line is an east bay mud/sewer outfall. It's an 8 foot in diameter pipe built when Harry Truman was President. That is the primary sanitary sewer outfall for the east bay. CalTrans developed as for alignment to avoid impact to that East Bay Mud Sewer outfall recognizing that San Francisco and the Navy desired a Southern Outfall. All the alternatives were analyzed to **inaudible** and the same level in the environmental document and this information was disclosed upon all of those.

Voice #8 With respect to the new bridge, the new bridge will require dredging the bay is quite shallow for over half the length of this bridge so a swath 200 yards wide will need to be dredged for any alignment for a bridge to be constructed. Remember were gonna build 2 bridges side by side separated by 50 feet. Large marine vessels need to get on either side so they can have cranes and lift in place large pieces of equipment. It is our desire to not relocate the East Bay Mud Sewer Outfall so we did not wish to have an alternative which had dredging ontop of that Outfall or immediately adjacent to it that would damage it. This is the alternative which Cal Trans has identified as they preferred alternative this is a view from Treasure Island which is approximately half mile away from the

bridge this is obviously a night shot. This the Admiral Nimitz house. The Admiral Nimitz house was constructed in 1903 it is a historic structure. Here you'll see hidden behind the shrubbery is the existing Bay Bridge. This is a historic structure which the Navy has concerns over and we appreciate their concerns. This is the porch of the Nimitz House. This is the view from the porch of the Nimitz House for the last 60 years standing on the porch of the Nimitz House you see a bridge. This is what the view would be for an N6 alignment. You will still see a bridge it will be a little closer. This is the view for the S4 alignment. It's a little further away but you still see a bridge. In all instances the view from the Nimitz House porch will entail looking at a bridge. In order to construct the bridge it will require temporary structures. These structures will be in place a total of two years. The construction of these temp structures, the demolition of the them and the restoration of the historic ground such the lawn where they will be some temp footings is all part of the project.. These are the temp structures as viewed from the porch of the Nimitz House for the N6 alignment. These is the view of the temp structures for a southern alignment as viewed from the porch of the Nimitz House. This is the torpedo building on the tip of Yurba Buena Island. This was built by the US Army in 1891 it isolated from the other structures because it has ammunitions and there was concerns that it would blow up and damage other structures. This is the existing bridge. The existing bridge is adjacent to it and casts a shadow on it. The N6 alignment passes over it. Under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act this is a visual intrusion. The new bridge will similarly cast a shadow on top of this structure. This shows you the too side by side. With that I'll turn it over to Brian **inaudible**. He'll talk about the geology.

Voice #9 Madam Chair I did want to today give you a sample another geotechnical sample from some of the exploration of work that was going on the project. I hoped it to be a sample from the last hole that we needed to drill on the entire project. I like to communicate to you today that I cannot do that since the US Navy has halted my team and myself from gaining access to Yurba Buena

Island. We've completed the geologic exploration required out in the bay, were very nearing the exploration in this portion of the bay. The area that we are having trouble is within three hundred yards of Yurba Buena Island. The information that we need that we do not have. This is a plan view, and Arial shot of the two structures. This would be west bound, this would be east bound. This is the extended area that is planned for the pylon if we build on the N6 alignment. We need an additional couple of hole, two or three holes to verify the stability of the rock where the pier will go. We also would like to have one additional boring out in the center of the main span because we anticipate a contractor may wish to build a falsework tower to support the structure during construction. That would bring the bid down because the contractor would know more information about the geology on the site. It's about getting a good deal for us on this structure. Particularly on the Island. This is a shot, an Arial shot of the island, Pan view, this is west bound, this is eat bound along the N6 alignment. The red drawing lines are the existing structure. We have some **inaudible** holes we would like to complete on the northern side of the island and underneath the existing bridge to support the design of the structure that we're planning right now. The Coast Guard has been very helpful. They have allowed us to already to complete the drilling we needed to have on the Southern side for the various work that we needed to complete on this structure. Now I want to communicate to you what I have asked for on the island. I want to make sure that everybody on this task force understands. The sot on the left is a typical land based drilling ridge. It basically off a truck the truck drives on to the land stabilizes with perhaps some outrigger. Lifts it's boom and then this operation is complete, is a advanced forward. Basically what happens it a tube about 4 inches in diameter is pushed into the ground and some soil is removed form that this is the pipe, the size of the pipe that I would like to place in approximately 50 holes on the island I don't think in anybody's judgement this is and intrusion or violation of Environmental Standards. However in the state of California to be a professional geologist and have assume responsibilities they need to be knowledgeable and professional about returning the drilling site to a safe condition when they leave.

Cal Trans is very knowledgeable about that so it Furgro our geotechnical team. We know how to do that we can do it safely we do it all over the state continuously, With that I do wish to tell you in my opinion we been delayed about four months. Four months and counting. Now there have been a couple of articles in the paper recently I do want to inform you our perspective on some of the changes and some of the risk. We've been monitoring this and we know about this, we actually been meeting with several people for over a year watching this in fact what is happening a very credible researcher, Tucson **inaudible** from a very credible organization the United States Geologic Survey has generated and continues to put additional information about the Hayward Fault which is less than 10 kilometers always from this bridge. It is very near field to this bridge. They are bring new information putting it on the table and it is being considered carefully by the whole professional field of seismology and geology and basically the is some credible information that suggests it has been a lot longer than what we thought the last time the Hayward Fault ruptured. Now that doesn't mean there is going to be a larger earthquake what is mean is that it is more likely to happen sooner than we thought and right now informally some scientists are suggesting the probability of the Hayward Fault going in the next 25 years is going to double just the nearest segment, the segment right through the Football Field, the University of California Campus has about a 28% chance of rupturing in the next 25 years. So if that doubles it gives you a sense of what we are talking about. It should tell you seismologists is a subjective field and you need to approach those things carefully. We are on top of this. Madam Chair I don't know if you know it, but you have a Navy. This is White lightning. It's your flagship. Everytime we meet I like to share with you a couple of exciting things that are going on. This is a ship that Furgro is operating now and along the Oakland Mall, which I think quite frankly is an exciting engineering challenge. That area liquefied under the **inaudible** in 1989. In the late 50's it also had some geotechincal problems it represents a very exciting challenge. This ship is the ship that we are using. The Furgro to go and expect high quality geotechincal information very near to the Oakland Mall. And this took place right around the

Holidays. This is the SeaScout the CPT driver. Basically this sits on the back of the ship and it pushed down a device, not unlike in shape what I just showed you and based on the pressures that develop on the base on the tube and pressures that develop on the side of the tube the shear they can **inaudible** identify what kind of materials are there and the strengths. We're giving you very good information from this more. Quite frankly it's turning out to be stronger than we hoped for. Because of the long years of consolidation.. And the SeaScout device on White Lightning just this side of the Mall. Now what I would like to do is focus attention on some of the progress near the self anchored suspension bridge and I would like to remind everybody that the west side is on Yurba Buena Island. And it spans both rock, water and soil underneath the bay. Now I would like to point out the western pier with respect to the self anchored suspension bridge everyone at first was very concerned about the tower and I think the architectural and engineering team has done an outstanding job with that tower and I have mentioned that before. Now my concern is this western pier. I am very concerned about that. Right now I don't have access to geotechnical information underneath that pier and that concerns me tremendously. I'd like to give you an example of some of the extra efforts the engineering design advisory panel specifically Roger Borchert of the US Geologic Survey recommended. He suggested we need to do something special with respect to the seismic analysis underneath the bay just off the island. This is a sample, just to give you a sense of some of the extra effort we're doing. We're conducting on this site. In an earthquake motions will impart move in this direction, quite a lot, perhaps a meter and a half longitudinally in this site, and perhaps a half a meter longitudinally in this location. What we have done, the geotechnical team, has **inaudible** soil, essential in a computer model, analytically **inaudible** the site into small pieces. Each piece of the soil is characterized within a computer model and the rock is characterized, ground motions are input at the bottom, seismologists give us input and we analyze how these waves propagate upward through the soil. The structure sits on top of that. We are analyzing the soil, the structure and the variations of all of the responses, altogether. This represents a new level of

practice. So we are responding to your engineering design advisory panel. I do want to emphasize this design is of an entire structure. This is a shot of the structure as it is envisioned at this time from the vista point in Oakland. It's being designed as one structure along the skyway, through the self anchored suspension bridge and onto the island. There's a lot going on the island. A couple things I want to share with you along the length of this bridge there's a lot of effort and were getting a lot of good input from your engineering design advisory panel. With respect to the pedestrian/Bicycle facility and for the advisory counsel I would like to share a lot of this information. For example, here you see the light standards notice you see, as for example for again this bridge is being designed from end to end, you see an element that is not that is repeated throughout the entire structure. You see this on the light standards, you see it here, in the railing supports, and you also can see on the main tower. The examples of one design experience along the entire length of the structure. The engineering design advisory panel is now offering us information that they would like to see some of these simplified. This is interesting because what they are telling us now is that perhaps we have gone too far and now they are telling us to back off a little bit. That's a good indication, if you are going to go through a process, it is a good indication that you are zeroing in on a lot of things. This is another example, we were very interested in making sure the experience along the skyway is exciting. Here's an example of one of the areas where e-dap is offering more advice. Here you see the supports for the railing along the length of the bridge. Here they are asking us to minimize these, take some of these away to open up the view even more, so we can see even more of the activity there at the port of Oakland along the Skyway. I do want to talk a little bit about these piers. There's been a lot of talk about those piers. I want to share with you that from an engineering and architectural perspective these are pretty exciting piers.

Basically, they have to do an awful too. Some of the spans along the skyway are 160 meters long, there are effectively 7 lanes of traffic being carried across this bridge. The cross section is complex, architecturally the architecture team has

spent time considering and **inaudible** through a whole series of surfaces, shapes, angles, textures and even pigments, colors of these piers. They've looked though all those and from their professional experience they have identified this shape as the shape that is appropriate for this pier. At the same time this is to be architecturally exciting and it certainly is, engineering wise there is a lot going on in this section. In a large earthquake we have to manage the very large deformations. This structure going to be moving back and forth. Were going to manage the damage that could develop right at this section. That means this section has to be highly engineered, this section has to be able to bend not unlike a paperclip and be able to bend and still be able to function and we have to be able to repair it quickly. We have gotta be able to observe it quickly we have to know an awful lot about that. AN engineering team is very much active. They are on top of this and their going to do a good job. Recent were about ready to sign about a one million dollar task order to have this cross section proof tested at the University of California laboratory. This is a very good design. Architecturally and engineering wise. New and improved. On the island I want to talk a little bit about what's going on the island so you feel like you know what's going on in the transition. Again there are two things going on. Were going in and out of the tunnel but we also have to go from a doubledeck system through the tunnel to a side by side ramps. This is the east bound ramp the west bound ramp is here and goes on just before the tunnel the west bound offramp comes down here turns off at this direction and the west off ramp goes right there and the excuse me east bound onramp goes on right there. All the ramps are taking right there there's a lot going on what I want to do is show you what the cross section looks like this okay you see the support of the upper structure support of the lower structure down below and we have the off ramp that is the east bound off ramp that you saw in the last picture. SO there is a lot of things going on a lot of things have to happen. We are continuing to work on optimizing this design but at the same time you see there are foundations that have to be designed here an even some of the depths for example of this beam have to be fully designed to know the seismic input before you can even fully design these.

SO these are examples of why I need geological information before I can finalize this. This structure is being designed, it is not a unit all by itself, but as part of the entire structure. That is why you see elements for example in the skyway that I pointed out for bicycle pedestrian facility there in compatible with the tower you also see some of those elements along the length of that transition structure. SO the idea of someone pulling out a single piece of this project isn't compatible with the entire bridge design philosophically. Which has been developed. I want to remind you that we have a conflict in the transition structure where we are going to have to do some staging. The finally structure could be built here and stopped here a west bound temp structure built here and connected in and east bound temp structure constructed here and tied into the old bridge. Move traffic onto it, remove the existing structure, build a perm new structure in its place and then take down the temp structures. No I do want to tell you that those perm, temp there also large structures, 5 lanes each direction. And they will have considerable shadow on the island, both to the south where the Coast Guard is and both to the north where some of the historic structures are. This is another shot of some of those temp structures will look like. When it's finally done this gives you a shot this is the coast guard facility you see a lot of the open area to the south. To the North this is what it could look when construction is completed. This building is the firehouse that a lot of people have talked about. This is the Nimits House. Dennis showed you imaged looking in this direction. I do want to tell you a little about construction. Were trying to make sure that we interact with the contractor as much as we can that's they way you get a good bid and on a project that could be well over a billion dollars its good to take measure that try to get a good bid early on. There's a lot of concern about these very large piles going in at an angle. We signed an approximately we signed a task order to fund a pile installation demonstration project. This summer we would hope to place two very large piles in the bay to make techniques information available to the bidding contractors to get a good price remove uncertainty from the bid. We also envision a large concrete section being cast some location around the bay and then shipped into place on large barges. To the construction site and we see

those being lifted into place. I can almost see members of the bay bridge design task force up on top of that watching. On the self anchored suspension bridge, right now the low bidder knows the construction technique that is going to be built. But right now the engineering team knows the self anchored suspension bridge is being built in this fashion. The tower will go up large section of the steel box girder will be lifted up and placed on top of a false work bin out in the middle of the bay. It's this falsework bin that we can get a much better price on if we give the contractor information about this site it is within 300 yards of Yorba Buena island therefor the Navy won't let me go out and get that information. That's the recommended design and were excited to give you that structure.

Voice #10 The lights please **Inaudible...**

Voice #11 Yes Mary had to leave, does anyone have a questions for the staff at this particular time?

Voice #12, Madam Chair, I do want to ask what is this Navy departments situation status other than just allow you to do the testing what is the substance of the objection and how are you going to address it?

Voice #9 The US government owns all of Yurba Buena Island

Voice # 12 So the Government owns part and the Navy owns part.

Voice #9 So in order for CalTrans to take any action to achieve seismic safety we will need permission from the US Government. The state cannot condemn a Federal agency to obtain land or rights. So we are in consultation with various federal agencies last week there was a meeting of the council on environmental quality in Washington DC. The Council on Environmental Quality on paper reports to the President of the United States there located about a half block form the white house. And they called in all the federal agencies to have a

meeting to sort out among the federal agencies what the position might be they've had previous meetings over the last year, the last two meeting the Navy has participated in and there is an upcoming meeting on January 27th. So via consultation process the federal agencies are getting together and we look forward to these issues being resolved.

Voice # 12 The Navy has the Island now but it will be transferred to San Francisco from the Navy to the city. Will the Navy's objection change at that point?

Voice #9 It would be improper for me to speak for the Navy it is best that that question be asked of the Navy.

Voice #12 Let me ask this from your vantage point.. what would be the advantage it's objection after it no longer has possession of the Island?

Voice #9 In all likelihood the Navy will have ownership when it is time for us to do our seismic safety so the Navy's position is very important to us.

Voice #12 You did no answer my question

Voice #9 That is correct.

Voice #12 A represent of the Navy is here to testify so you might want to ask him directly.

Voice #1 At that particular time. Any other questions? It appears that most of the speaker cards want to address this at this time for what I can see. As a reminder you do have 5 minutes and we will time that very carefully. It will be taken in the order they are turned in.

Voice #9 We have covered item 2&3 on the agenda and Brian and Denise's report perhaps I could make the report on Item 4 just briefly and I know there are some public comments. In your packets are two letters concerning the issue of rail on the bay bridge. The first letter is to our chairman and the former director of CalTrans from the mayors of the cities where the ballot measures appeared. Containing, if I could summarize essentially two request the first request is that the design of the bridge **inaudible**, the second request is that some sort of study or analyses of rail options on the span be completed. The responses from this commission and I know you have deliberated on previously and CalTrans has summarized are essentially to those two questions, no and yes. On the question of terminating or suspending the design the response we made was that we didn't think that was advisable or necessary not necessary because as you know the design that you recommended that CalTrans has now identified as the preferred alternative will accommodate rail in the future at such time that might become feasible. So we don't think the eastern span design is the problem. The much greater problem about putting rail on the bridge is the western span and what you do on that span and how do you deal with rail on either shore and so we didn't think again it was either desirable or necessary to suspend the design for that purpose. And both CalTrans and MTC responded in that fashion. We also responded however that there were a number of issues that did appear worthy of study not only with respect to the proposal that's been discussed most in the press about rail on the bridge itself but also looking at options for improving the existing transit surveys in that corridor as you know there already is a railroad in the corridor call BART, AC Transit runs buses there is ferry service there are a number of options in the corridor that could be improved very quickly at relatively low cost vs. a higher cost and much longer term rail system. We also suggested that the desirability of examining an entirely separate rail guide way in the corridor, that's an idea that we have study here at MTC before and we thought there might be some purpose in updating that information so we responded to the second question about a rail study in the affirmative and this point we are waiting to arrange a meeting between the staffs of the respective sites, and our

agency and CalTrans so that we can move forward we hope on that part of the issue.

With regard to the rail study and your answer that we have designed the bridge for rail this does preempt heavy rail and inner-city rail which the Mayors did ask be part of the study. That's correct. This design was designed to accommodate, CalTrans needed to establish some standards, so loading and I believe they used an average of about a dozen different rail systems around the US as the average loading that this design will accommodate. By the way is about the loading that the old key trains had on the old bridge. This bridge has never carried heavy rail in its existence. Steve, I fully appreciate Northern Alignment design has been progressing substantially since last time, but I continue to hear about the Southern Alignment proposal by the City of San Francisco as far as I'm concerned I don't believe that the task force has had a chance to view that proposal in the past. I want to hear from you what is your understanding what is your knowledge of the Southern Alignment proposal and if that becomes a major point of dispute what does that mean to the entire design that we have been moving along for the Bay Bridge. Commissioner if I could I would like to start the answer then ask Dennis to finish it. As you know your task force and the commission made two sets of recommendations on the eastern span the first set of recommendations you made were in the summer of 1997 soon after we began that process and that's when you may a recommendation based upon a recommendation from your engineering and design panel for the northern alignment so at that time both the southern and northern alignment views were considered your engineering panel considered you approved a northern alignment. The reason that happened first is that first CalTrans design team need to know where the bridge was going to be before they could design it because the locations very much determines what this bridge is going to look like in term of the foundation condition, That's where we took public comment and at that time comment we had from the public including from San Francisco will supportive of the northern alignment now that clearly changed and we will

have to deal with those changes. I will let Dennis if I could explain the alignment that has been suggested by San Francisco I have been briefed on it, I have, and we have seen it, it is not an alignment that is studied in the environmental impact statement it is one that CalTrans initially considered and then discarded and I think I'll Dennis elaborate on those reasons. Certainly, the alignment San Francisco proposed is very similar to what we call the S1 alignment however the have modified as it touches down on the shore. It is their desire to minimize impacts to the port of Oakland to have less of an effect at that touch down. Several weeks ago Steve Hemminger and I attended a briefing of San Francisco staff on Treasure Island where Duncan Jones of Corva Engineering did a presentation on the alignment. We would be able to minimize the impact on the Oakland shore by crossing through some historic structures which obviously would have to modify but that is not a reason to throw it that's a design variation that could easily be modified. The principal concerns with the southern alignment is that east bay mud sewer outfall which was constructed in 1950 and to build this bridge requires a wide swath a dredging that dredging and the pile driving activity in close proximity to that east bay mud sewer outfall would damage it and so we developed a southern alignment that avoided the east bay mud sewer outfall and we dropped the southern alignment that we had that was similar to San Francisco's because of concerns about that east bay mud sewer outfall. Based on conversations as recently as last week east bay mud still maintains that it costs or hundred million dollars to move that sewer outfall they said the environmental process would take two years and the design and construction process would take three years so to relocate that east bay mud sewer outfall would take an additional 5 years we felt that was not prudent and that was inconsistent with the purpose of this project. Yes four alignment we developed specifically to avoid impact to the east bay mud sewer outfall. It does avoid impact. It does cross over that east bay mud sewer outfall at one location on land, in their letter dated Nov 20, 1998 East Bay Mud said that in itself may still require relocation of the sewer outfall. We disagreed with that, we think it may still be possible to construct and S4 alignment none the less our identified

preferred alignment is the N6 alignment which is consistent with MTC recommendation.

Does that answer your question. In your presentation you mentioned that the southern alignment maybe S1 or S4, but southern alignment were also objected to by the port of Oakland and by East Bay regional Park for their own reasons. Did the San Francisco alignment satisfy their concerns or would there also be those objections? The San Francisco alignment has less impact on the port of Oakland than the Cal Trans Southern Alignment although I can't speak for the port I Believe the Port is present but it does have some impact however to minimize that impact it does go over the key pier historic substation which is by itself a historic structure so under title 23 of the us government code that would be a **inaudible**. And under that law you have to miss it so I'm not sure if their alignment would not have similar impacts to our S4 alignment once is addressed the 4F issue. I think that's one of the principal concerns to the port is how much land is available. The East Bay Regional Park district , they also are present, so they can speak for themselves, but the correspondence we have in writing states that they clearly prefer a northern alignment it provides a larger continuous land mass for a park on the Oakland touchdown. Can you give us some estimate on both the additional costs on the San Francisco alignment and the time that we would have to loss by re-design. All costs, the bridge, the east bay outfall costs anything else. If a southern alignment required a relocation of the east bay outfall it's over a 100 million dollars and it's 5 years. S1 or modified S1 alignment requires that in our professional opinion and in the opinion of the east bay mud sewer folks . The S4 alignment may or may not require a relocation. We developed it to avoid a relocation. There are costs and there are time implications if any change when you made a decision in June of 1998 we commenced risk design. We have spent approximately 20 million dollars on the design effort since then. So all that work would have to be thrown away. Brian talked about drilling holes in the bay along each pier location of this N6 alignment. That 10 million dollars does not help you on an S4 alignment. You

throw that away you drill new holes. So there is deficiently throw away costs. With respect to just inflation. Inflation on a billion and a half dollars at 3.3% a year is 50 million a year. So setting aside construction cost differences inflation in and of it's self is 50 million a year. Also what comes into play is the whole purpose of the project that was so eloquently stated by your chair at the start of this meeting. This is a seismic safety project. So if one desires to re-visit any decisions they need to do that in an informed fashion understanding the seismic risks as well as the costs. Quite frankly the seismic risks are probably of greater concern than the costs. I would like to add that this structure is not appropriate for a southern alignment that structure will not fit on a southern alignment. When you come out of the tunnel to the south the curve is tighter and it extends well out into the bay. You can only come out of that curve so gradually. That structure will not fit in a southern alignment. To build a self-anchored suspension bridge on the southern alignment pushed the tower 200 feet further to the east which is in deeper water and in much greater depth in the bedrock than it is for the northern alignment that you have selected. So the probability is that there are higher bridge construction costs as a result as well, right, in addition to the delay costs and time and in risk.

Question: To be fair to the situation would you think **inaudible**, also reasonable to assume that the department and CalTrans has been taking the position that we are moving ahead on the basis of a risk design? That potentially can fail?

Answer: Correct

Question: All this elements, the time the 20 million or 30 million,

Answer: We are prepared to throw all that money away..

Questioner: Right in the evenly that EIS is **inaudible**

Answer: Technically MTC makes recommendations but technically the federal highway administration and Cal Trans are the decision makers and when we make that NEEPA decision with the recorded decision in the Summer of this year, that will be the formal decision. If that decision is different from what we have been doing risk design on we're prepared to throw that risk design away. The reason we pursued risk design is because it was an opportunity to perhaps buy back a year and provide public safety sooner.

Question: SO it is reasonable to say that it always a possibility that we will lose the investment and the time that invested so far?

Answer: That's correct and CalTrans knowingly embarked upon this path in June of last year knowing that it was prior to an environmental decision with the understanding that we would be prepared to throw all that away.

Thank You

Chair: The first person is Ken Parson..Ken Parsons

Ken Parson: I don't have a prepared presentation, as a part of the ongoing lack of coordination on the part of others in the Navy I did not hear about this meeting the Navy did not hear about this meeting until this afternoon, the last meeting that we heard about I got a card in the mail the day of the meeting. Just answer a few questions that were asked her today. As a federal agency and owner of the property and we will be probably until about 2004 we as a federal agency were never invited to participate in coming up with criteria we did not sign off on any criteria for the basis of the bridge design or environmental or otherwise. Perhaps we would not be where we are today if there had been better coordination upfront. The Navy's position has always been that we do not oppose a bridge. The Navy's position has been that the decision should be made based on the NEEPA process. The NEEPA process is still ongoing, a draft was completed as Dennis mentioned we made our comments, we felt the document was

inadequate We felt that is was not fairly addressing all the issues. It did not go into enough detail on impacts to historic properties or all the alternatives. With respect to the issue of the borings if borings are so critical on making decisions on the bridge then the navy's position was that we should have looked at borings for all the alternatives and address those in the NEEPA documents. They were not in the NEEPA document. The Navy's position has been to be objective in the process and look at all the alternatives. The request that came to the department of navy was just to do borings for the northern alignment. As I said we will own the land probably up to 2004 based on our clean-up program and our negotiation. There is no guarantee just to set the record clear were the navy and city are in the process of transferring the property from the navy to the city. The is no guarantee that that will happen. That's going to be based on negotiations for the fair value on the island. We are also doing our own NEEPA process based on the re-use of the land for developed for by the city of San Francisco. We have received a recent request from CalTrans to do some pot-holing on the island that could be used no matter what alternative is addressed and we will probably go ahead and approve that. Bear in mind that the NEEPA process is still underway. I have been a planner for the department of defense and working in private practice for about 30 years. The EIS that was reviewed got a rating of three from the EPA. It had a very poor review on our part because we did not feel the treated the alternatives clearly and so the issue is till up in the air. I'm sorry that Dennis keeps not mentioning, he minimizing the impact of the comments. The EPA gave the EIS a rating of three. In my 30 years I've never seen a federally sponsored project given a rating of three. That is an unsatisfactory document basically. It may be for on piece of the document, but none the less it is an unsatiactory document. The navy position has been let's build the best bridge and the navy is very concerned that the representatives of CalTrans would try to put the ownus that we are not concerned about the safety of the community as a whole. Speaking as a private citizen and a resident of the bay area who uses that bridge, it's taken 10 years to get where we are now by CalTrans to turn around and say the navy who wants to say that a right decision is made, is

endangering the public is irresponsible and to continue to spend money and again I'm saying this a private citizen, to continue to spend money on the design when the property owner which is the department of defense has said that they are opposed to the northern alignment seems like maybe we are not spending our money as best we could. Especially when we talk about whether we will have enough money to build the bridge if we have this risk and we have to change direction.. This is a personal observation this is not the Navy's position. Again I apologize, but I just heard about this meeting today so I haven't really prepared comments.

Chair: Any questions?

Questions: You said you were not invited into the process, does the navy only testify when you are invited when you get public hearings and there is a public process going on that effects your property do we not hear from the navy?

Answer: We did not know for the first..for the last year and a half..the last year

Interrupt: does nobody in the navy read the paper?

Answer: Nobody..we were e not aware that meetings were going on covering this criteria, we were never invited.

Response: Well I find that a pretty flimsy excuse, I'm sorry.

Chair: Okay

Navy Rep: I am not here to be attacked

Chair: Thank you sir

Chair: Ann Marie Conroy

Ann Marie Conroy: Good afternoon commissioners, I'm here as executive director of the Treasure Island development authority and on behalf of the Mayor of San Francisco. I did testify in, I think it was June when the final decision was made here at MTC. We expressed our deep concern for the base re-use for the former naval station on Treasure Island which is the northern portion of Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island proper. We did make comment along with the navy on the last EIS the city of San Francisco stands ready to pursue litigation if necessary we stand with the US Navy in looking at the impacts of this re-use plan we gave extensive comments one of which is the jeopardizing of the NEEPA process in that when anyone criticizes or suggested other alternatives they are accused of jeopardizing lives and throwing tens of thousand of dollars away and those types of things. So we believe that has chilled public comment substantially during the NEEPA Process, during the comment period for the bridge. SO that will be on our things that we are exploring from a legal standpoint .. My concerns as the director of this island is the economics, the impact of this bridge and I have to say the arrogance with which we have been treated by both CalTrans and MTC staff I have to stand with the Navy, we do get last minute notices for meetings . We feel that we are ignored, we feel we are not listened to we have gone out, and as Commissioner Siracuse has pointed out, and Supervisor Shay and pursued a modified S1 alignment that we think works and we have contacted East Bay Mud, we have been in meetings with the Port of Oakland, we have been in meetings with the city of Oakland so that we can design a southern alignment that works for everyone. It is not true that East Bay Mud opposed what we are looking at, it is not true that the city of Oakland is opposes the modified S1.

So you don't have a project, part of the certification for the environmental document will require a memorandum of agreement on those historic structures. You will never get that from the US Navy. There will not be a certification of that

environmental document. So are very serious about sitting down and designing a modified S1 to answer your questions Commissioner Siracusa we believe the S1 will actually be cheaper, we can straddle the East Bay Mud Outfall, we would like an opportunity as Supervisor Shay has pointed out to at least show it to you, to at least get it to you. We would like to have an opportunity to show it to the Governor. We have been assured of that, we would also like to show it to the Design Task Force here it's very important, were working in an **inaudible** way with all the other agencies that are impacted and we believe that we can come up with a bridge that works for everyone. That's shorter, it's cheaper, other utilities have to be straddled with the Northern Alignment just as they will have to with the Southern Alignment. And we have an entire presentation to give to you. They city has spent enormous hours and enormous sums of money with Corve engineers and structural engineers that we need to come to you because we are being blocked, we feel, at a staff level from showing you a design that could work for everyone and we would like at least an opportunity to share that with you. We don't want to delay the process, we don't want to have to go into litigation, we don't want to have to sue, we don't want to have to go through all those things. We don't want to be the bad guy, the Navy doesn't want to be the bad guy. We are trying are best to put together a modified S1 that will work. Part of the problem is that it was not studied in the environmental document, and yes there will probably have to be a re-circulation of the document in order to look at the modified S1. But given the time that that would take versus trying to go for, for us to pursue litigation, mitigation, blocking the memorandum of agreement, keeping the Navy with us, on our side to block the property from being taken. The time value that is saved in just sitting down and getting to an **inaudible** position will benefit everyone.

Question: Sorry to dominate this, that was a fine statement, I concerned about as to why the city of San Francisco and the base re-sue authority is so adamant about the loss of six acres within the context of the reasonable need for the bridge and your overall development opportunities on Yerba Buena Island and

TI. Six acres doesn't seem to be significant with respect to realizing the economic potential of the islands. Are those therefore, I mean number one would you agree with that and secondly, and if so, it is significant.

Answer: It is far more significant that six acres of property. It's the impact to the historic structures. It's the impact to the island as a whole. One of the slides that was left out, very conveniently is the north to north detour. This is the shot from the Nimits mansion. And this was left out of your slide presentation. So this was very important, I know that looking at the North South, but this is the North North that has also been looked at. And this pretty much wipes out the Nimits mansion.

Questions: We identified the North South detours as the preferred alternative so the north north is not our desire to construct so that's why I didn't keep that slide in the presentation, to answer your question. I

Question: it's not, your saying the northern alignment is not the better or the best alignment, you're saying that even if it is the impact on the island is such that you would oppose it regardless. Are you making it a case about the preferrability of the alignment absent the impact on Yerba Buena Island.

Answer: We believe that the modified S1 is straighter, more seismically sound in that, and I'm sure that CalTrans will design the best most seismically sound bridge which ever the alternative ends up being. However the straight line of the southern alignment on the S1 in talking to other structural engineers outside of CalTrans working with Corve, that is easier to design from an engineering stand point the turn of the this northern alignment is actually in the deepest bay mud that of the new bay mud. So the bridge that we're looking at from the geology, we've hired a geologists, we've gone through all of that, we just need an opportunity to go through all of that with this task force to show you the geology of the bay that you can get to deeper bay muds more solid bay muds, more quickly, so that saves money. Those types of things. We really want that

opportunity. But to answer your question about the six acres, this is isn't about six acres on Yerba Buena Island, this is about taking away the opportunities for the city of San Francisco and it's base re-use plan. We have planned for the torpedo house will be lost to us, you're going to put a restaurant underneath a bridge that's what's planned for there, it's a beautiful old structure. It will make a wonder micro-brewery something very special out on the water. The peninsula there would be a great place for live/work space, condos, a conference center or toward the water, a bed and breakfast. You wouldn't want a bed and breakfast right there by the bridge.

Chair: Our question was answered without going into the history of every building Okay?

Answer: But in our response to the draftee I asked and commissioner I'll get this to you, **Inaudible**, did a report for us on the economic impact of this bridge and here it is and it is at least 50 million dollars over a ten year period to the city of San Francisco and the base re-use plan.

Chair: Thanks You, the next on is Sandra Treefall. I probably mis-pronounced the last name.

Voice: Is it out of order or **inaudible**

Voice: I think one possibility, most of the impact information you receive here is first presented to your engineering and design advisory panel and perhaps if there's a request or a desire for San Francisco to present the proposal that should take place first and that could be received by you with together with any comments or advise they have about it. These are as you know three different experts in structural engineering and seismology who have been advising you about the recommendations that you have made.

Voice: I thought this was a joint meeting, it seem to me that our having the advantage of hearing their comments and questions,

Voice; you could here them directly, we would have to just extend the table a little bit.

Chair: Can we bring up this issue after we hear al the public input

Voice: I think you will also want to hear, if not today, at some date CalTrans's response to this alignment and the fact they did study it and rejected it for specific reasons.

Voice: For the record, I just want to echo Commissioner, **inaudible**, request to see that San Francisco will have a chance to make their presentation so the issue can be addressed openly, in a state of rambling on, I don't think it does any good to the project if you don't hear from San Francisco and by hearing and listen to San Francisco position there may be some good we can say accept or reject if that's the case, but there must be a chance for them to make their presentation. Once more, and let's do it quickly.

Chair: Okay we can pick after all of the public input today and we can discuss the issue. Yes I'm sorry

Sandra: Oh it's fascinating, My name is Sandra Throatfall I live in the east bay, Oakland to be specific. My full time vocation is public access tot he water. One of my frustrations and the reason I'm choosing to speak to you today is the very recent display of Navy displeasure and San Francisco displeasure over the process that you and additional committee staff and such have been spending over two years on. This feels a lot like the squeaky wheel to me and I have to tell you, I live in Oakland, I remember Loma Preata very clearly. And the amount of money and given it's a public agency, I think this should be public information

that San Francisco has chosen to spend to fight a decision after it has been made should be public information that San Francisco has chosen to spend to fight a decision after it has been made has got to somehow equalize any loss to a B&B. But I'm getting, I'm sorry I'm just sitting here listening to this is difficult at best. Mr. Parsons reference to the EPA giving it a code three, what he failed to mention was it has to do with dredge disposal that was the only point that the EPA questioned and that's something that LTM is working very hard on also. That does not have to do with alignment or engineering. Oakland tends to be the fall candidate, as in fall back. To any other city in the bay area when they don't like something that happening let Oakland take the brunt of it. So San Francisco now says let Oakland take the brunt of the southern alignment. Let Oakland lose what could be an incredible park to the tune of 25 acres. Let Oakland Port which is a regional port somehow re-align things for the Oakland shoreline so that San Francisco can have a Bed & Breakfast on Yerba Buena. This is not equitable. This is not fair. And I really appreciate the comment that you made regarding public trust, tidelands trust, yes Treasure Island has been deemed tidelands trust but 100 feet all around Yerba Buena is also tidelands trusts. Which entitles the public to access. Housing on that coast shoreline does not belong you are privatizing public land. So, I would like to say go with what we have, do it as soon as possible and let's not wait for the next big quake. Thank You for your time.

Chair: Thank you very much The next person is Steve Low.

Steve Low: Speaking in rebuttal. Actually I'm here representing the West Oakland Commerce Association. Most of the business in West Oakland are going to be most profoundly impacted by the build out of this bridge and we are very concerned about the issues of transportation across the bridge with respect to the heavy rail. As you know, there is a high speed rail commission that I don't know how much they have been interacting with this body but we have to understand that there is going to be high speed rail coming through Oakland

it's most likely going to have to find a way over to San Francisco some way. People are not happy about dismounting from one transportation mode to get onto BART, to get onto another system to get over to San Francisco. I think that if high speed rail comes to the bay area it's most likely going some kind of loop up the peninsula and over to Oakland. And that begs the question, can this be accommodated by the new bridge. So there's a little handout I have here. Because there is a solution to all of this and it's what's called the right bridge, and it's the frankly right thing. I think some of you are familiar with it. I would like to hand out a few of these to various members and keep a couple for handing out to other interested parties.

Chair: Brian would you take of that Thank You.

Steve Low: Any familiarity with the right bridge, the Frank Lloyd Wright bridge it is interesting that the bridge could, from everything I understand out it and I don't understand a lot because the this was downloaded today from the 'wrightbridge.com' that it could bring about a northern departure from the Oakland side and a southern departure form the Yerba Buena side. That's something to consider as a solution for this vexing problem.

Chair: Thank you sir. Victoria Eisen

Victoria Eisen: Hello I'm chair of the bay bridge bicycle/pedestrian committee. I'm just here to say a few things about CalTrans willingness to meet with us and discuss the design aspects of the east bound pathway and also Dennis's, we appreciate Dennis's commitment earlier in the meeting to work with us on the westbound. As you know MTC has recommended a single bicycle and pedestrian path 15 feet wide on the south side of the new bridge. The design details, however have been determined or finalized. Our committee has been asked to advise CalTrans and MTC on these details. They include things like to possibility of belevderes and areas where benches could be located outside of the flow of bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Roadway paving materials that might

minimize the noise to the path users and some lathing options that might be integrated into the pathway itself. Our concern mentioned briefly by your committee chair before he had to leave it that CalTrans response to our inquiry are taking a long time and this impedes our ability to have a meaningful dialog with CalTrans's architects and engineers. We want, just what we are asking for is an assurance that the time it is taking CalTrans to respond to our committees questions and suggestions with respect to the pathway design is not precluding any potential path amenities particularly those that might impact the new bridge structure.

Chair: Thank You does staff want to respond?

Voice: We have taken lots of notes and we apologize that we have not been as responsive as we need to be on these issues with them.

Chair: Thank you, Mayor **Inaudible**

Mayor: Good afternoon members of the task force and members of the public, doesn't somebody recognize that this project has a myriad of problems. I mean real big problems. I mean in one of the imputes behind the new director of CalTrans was the bridge design and getting things changed. So while the present the last day he at work, **inaudible**, writes a letter to the mayor so I guess that's supposed to be a concrete position for CalTrans but I think that's all going to change. There was a meeting yesterday over in San Francisco where it was pretty apparent that the San Francisco board of supervisor was going to take a strong position on what's going to happen with the trans-bay terminal, looking at rail over the bridge I mean the bridge and the terminal were all built together, they have to work together, doesn't somebody realize that this new design has to work in conjunction with the terminal? And possible future rail on the bridge. There is the interest in looking at potential inner-city rail, this should be looked at as a transportation structure, this isn't really just a seismic safety project

although that's the way it has been put out so far. The environmental document as you can see from the Navy and other people has tremendous problems. I mean how can you just continue to move forward with this in light of all these problems, potential lawsuits, oppositions from the cities that are most affected by it. Opposition from the people who are going to be looking at the future of Treasure Island. You gonna have new commissioners next month so you may have a different vote in the commission. I don't know, doesn't anyone see that there is a problem here, somebody needs to stop and look at what were doing and try to coordinate it so it works and so it satisfies everybody. The arrogance of the MTC, you don't even want to listen to the city of San Francisco's objections or you may find it appropriate to listen to it. I mean how can this go on this way. I mean I think this whole thing is irresponsible and somebody needs to get it going in the right direction.

Chair: Thank You John Sutter

John Sutter: My name is John Sutter and I'm a member of the Board of Directors for the East Bay Regional Park District. And the board that I represent includes Oakland or most of Oakland and the site of the new bridge. We are very much concerned about the effect of the alignment on Gateway Park. Gateway Park is the proposal for a really exciting new park at the touchdown of the bay bridge where it comes into Oakland. We have the potential of having a really wonderful view as one approached Oakland rather industrial junk. It will have the opportunity, it will give the opportunity for people throughout the bay area to enjoy fabulous views from the westerly point of the Gateway Park. It will be truly an important amenity to the people of this region. And that's why I get really nervous when I read articles about the alignment as there was one this morning in the Oakland Tribune, which quoted James Roberts, Director of CalTrans Engineering Services says were looking a maybe a little more flexibility in doing what needs to be done to satisfy both San Francisco and Oakland and that doesn't necessarily mean re-designing etc. Well I don't know what that means

but our concerns is the alignment and how it affects Gateway Park. And from the designs that I have seen so far a southern alignment would cut right through Gateway Park and wouldn't really end up with a park that we would be proud of. So there's a trade off here. Who's amenity is more important? Is a amenity that San Francisco wants at Yerba Buena Island more important than an amenity for the east bay at Gateway Point? I don't think so, I think actually this is an amenity for everybody in the bay area that were attempting to establish including the people of San Francisco. So I would hope that you keep our thoughts in mind and our concerns in mind in any further discussions about the alignment. If I could switch gears, I would just like to say a few things as an individual, and that relates to the scope of your studies. I wrote a letter several months ago to CalTrans suggesting that there be a study of a potential bicycle and pedestrian bridge from the westerly point of Emoryville where Powell Street dead ends in Emoryville to the westerly point of our proposed Gateway Park. I don't know what it would cost, I don't know if it's feasible there may be all kinds of yeas and nays. But it seems to me that this is the time to look at that possibility it would be a great enhancement to the Bay trail if one gets on a bicycle in Albany or Richmond or Berkeley and wants to go San Francisco the cyclyst could ride out to the westerly point of Emoryville then go over a pedestrian bridge, to reach the Bay Bridge, it would be a quicker route and a very scenic route and a great tourist attraction. I'm not saying that we should not also do the **inaudible**, which CalTrans ahs already committed to do, I think that's important. But if this alignment were done and a bridge were built for pedestrians and cyclists there could be a loop trail where a kid in west Oakland could get on his bike ride to Gateway Park, ride from Gateway Park across the bay the Emoryville, ride through Emoryville and back on land east of the Hwy 80 back to his own home in west Oakland. I think it's got a lot of potential. I would hope your staff takes a look at it. And now that your board has decided that you are going to have a bike trail it becomes a lot more relevant.

Chair: Thank you sir. Marina Carlson

Marina Carlson: Thank You, My name is Marina Carlson I'm here today representing the City of Oakland. You know I'm gonna try this one more time. Every morning what we hear and see on the morning news and I quote "the metering lights are on at the toll plaza and the traffic is backed up the maze. Smooth traffic conditions on the bridge are a result of the backed up traffic at the entrance to the bridge. And in 2004 when the new bridge is opened, how far and for how long will the traffic be backed up. When the autos are backed up in Oakland who is breathing in the air pollution created by the traffic jam. These issues are not new and these issues are part of the project and need to be addressed in the environmental document. Turning a blind eye to a president problem will not alleviate the situation. The capacity issue has been brought up since we started in response to the letter by Mr. Van Logan, Sells and his reference to the four bay area cities waving things for future leaders, I just want to say that the four bay area cities and their present leaders have a responsibility to explore ways to expand the existing plans. Incorporated all the engineering work that we have already completed. We disagree that it prudent to investigate other options separate from this project. Costs associated with separate studies that are for the same corridor would duplicative and expensive. The engineering structural issues associated with the alignment and seismic force have already been done and should be used to solve the problems at this point rather than at some uncertain date in the future. Are the rules to exclude the transit issue set in concrete, who are the future leaders we are waiting for? The decision makers are here now and the four bay area cities want the option for passenger rail studied now we don't want to leave problems for others to solve and we don't want to create problems for our children to solve. Finally we regret that the design of the bridge for 85% of the bridge has not metamorphosized to the point that we had hoped. We will continue to offer to work on these issues with CalTrans. We thank you for all the opportunities to participate you have so far. And we look forward to working with MTC, CalTrans and other agencies in developing the Oakland touchdown and the park. We want to see the existing

design, in the existing design how rail could be most effective. Thank you very much.

Chair: One Question, okay Angelo, one question.

Angelo: It just occurred to me the four resolutions, including Oakland's about bridge and the rail has been totally silent on what happens beyond the terminus, the eastern and western terminus of the bridge with respect to the extension of rail to wherever. Has the city of Oakland done anything to analyze rail routes through Oakland and to points east or north. I've not heard anything at all that goes beyond studying rail on the bridge and that's rail to no-where then.

Marina Carlson: Well I don't think we were just trying to get the rail on the bridge we wanted to get it on points on both sides so that people could embark and disembark. Clearly the trans-bay terminal is an excellent opportunity for a landing of such a facility. And on the eastern shore, I imagine we just need to take a look at it I can't believe the problem is insurmountable.

Angelo: So you're suggesting that the back up could be relieved by people coming to a park and ride lot terminus and getting on the rail and then transferring.

Marina Carlson: No No I'm suggesting that the study look exactly at what you are asking. I don't have those answers that's why we need the study done.

Angelo: My question back to you is, is the city of Oakland ready to look at rail through Oakland if in fact that's the eastern terminus.

Marina Carlson: We will be glad to look at whatever we can along with CalTrans so that we can solve the problems. Thank You

Chair: Thank You, Norman Raulf

Norman Raulf: For the record, I'm Normal Raulf I too want to address the rail along the bridge. The staff made some statements earlier that they will carry rail, will carry trains that used to ride along the bridge. They also said that they had designed the thing to carry the average weight of several light rail vehicles that are in operation today. Well those numbers don't match up ladies and gentlemen, it so happens that there were three railroads that operated trains over the bridge. One of the them was the southern pacific. They had a system of electrified suburban rail lines. They used the electric multiple unit cars. Those cars were quite big, quite heavy . They were probably meet today's FRA standards. Those cars weighed 65 tons. They carry, they seated about 100 people figuring with standess maybe 120 people. At an average of 150 per, would be 9 tons of people. That means the laded weight was 74 tons. Those cars had four axles on them, that's 18.5 tons per axle. By the way, the French TGV trains weighed 16.75 tons per axle. The San Francisco, the **inaudible** cars weigh 24 tons and the have a crush load of a 150 people. That's 11.25 tons of people at a 150 pounds per. And that works out to be a little less than 6 tons per axle. The **inaudible**, I don't know what they weigh, I think they weigh about 30 tons, and then with the same crunch load works out to be a little less than 11 tons per axle. I dare say that the other light rail cars, Portland, Sand Diego, Sacramento etc. etc. would probably work out to be the same figures. I want to point out that there was a huge discrepancy between 7 tons per axle and 18.5 tons per axle. So the fact of the matter is if that's the design they have done they have not complied with the intent, the resolutions that were passed by the voters in the these various. At this point I supposed I should apologize to the board for inundating them with numbers. The intent was for rail, whatever, whether it might be light or heavy rail, or rapid transit, that is to be worked out. The idea is to have this bridge, which is a very important link, which would be capable of whatever might come in the future. East Bay connection would be worked out. The East Bay of course is the logical place for the San Francisco end of it. And

also the, when you ask them where is this space, there is not only the weight, but the space consideration. I haven't given any consideration, of well we will put it on the shoulder, yeah the shoulders are eight and a half feet wide and you need about 12 feet at least for a light rail line, probably about 13 or 14 feet for heavy rail line. Uh the numbers don't match up. So that is one of the reasons for the, you can begin to see the discontent, the reason for the discontent with the design and the frustration that a lot a people feel. What's going on here, they say they want a rail on the bridge, but there are not , the numbers don't match up, the designs don't batch up, so that is the reason why so many people are saying lets go back and take another look at this so it will really hold rail, whatever type of rail may come in the future and that's to be worked out. Thank You

Chair: Thank You

Voice: With all those numbers I got confused..the light rail you defined at what weight?

Norman Raulf: It doesn't really go by weight, lets see I'm trying to remember the is an official definition of light rail and I can't remember it but it is capable of operating on mixed traffic or on various typed of rights of way, and I can't recall if there is an actual weight specification. But rather the type of service it is used in, but these range from street car to what you might call rapid transit.

Voice: In this context, it seems as if the capacity of the bridge would bear a certain weight of rail, what's you are talk about.

Raulf: A certain type of railroad car yes.

Voice: And my questions is what is the discrepancy limit you would like to see on the outer limits of the bridge design?

Raulf: I don't know what they, they say the designed it to take the average of the current light rail system which is far as I can figure works out to be about 7 tons per axle, so compare that with 18.5 tons per axle the red cars have, that is a discrepancy of 11.5 tons per axle. In other words they should be designing at about 2 and half time the load per axle that they say they have designed.

Voice: The key system was 18 tons.

Raulf: I don't know what the weights of the key system were, I do have some literature at home describing the SP Rail cars and that's were I got those numbers from.

Voice: The SP Red cars, is that the Key System?

Raulf: No No I said there was three rail companies that operated trains over the bridge. That was the Key System, that was the last survivor, then there were the Southern Pacific and the Sacramento Northern and the ones I'm referring to, they were probably the heaviest of the bunch were the Southern Pacific cars.

Voice: Those are the older ones? Presumably from the 30's or 40's?

Raulf: They were built from various times from 1912 into the 20's, the Southern Pacific suburban, east bay suburban lines were electrified in boy I don't know, some historian correct me here, I think in about 1911 or 12 or 13 or somewhere in around there. Right up until the end they were probably using the same cars. In fact they had a few new ones in the 20's, but basically they were the same things. There's two or three of those cars are still in existence at railroad museums. If you really wanted to see what they look like in the flesh.

Chair: Okay we have some questions from the staff then we are going on to our final speaker.

Voice: Just an a follow-up, do you agree with the methodological approach? That tons per axle is the way to measure and what do we have if that's the case.

Voice: A couple of clarifications, one id the shoulders are 10 feet on the left 10 feet on the right and 40 of shoulders out there, there are not 8 foot shoulders on this bridge clearly the bridge is not being designed for the train that you referenced. It is being designed for light rail and tons per axle is not a good characterization. To simplify it we typically do pounds per linear foot. That in and of it's self is also a characterization that is not fully accurate. So the train that he specifies weighs more and the weight per linear foot is greater than we are designing it for.

Voice: Can you describe what kind of train would go on one the bay bridge?

Voice: What do you mean?

Voice: Could BART gone on it?

Voice: NO, the San Francisco metro could

Voice: SO it's designed for the San Francisco Metro, San Jose Metro, Sacramento Metro, you know light rail type of cars, it is not designed for BART, BART has deflection criteria as well as weight criteria and this deflection criteria is quite severe compared to most train systems. Then once you get into the capitols you get into heavier weights and then you also have things when trains accelerate and when the decelerate how they transfer loads to the bridge.

Voice: Then it would not carry Cal Trains for example?

Voice: It wouldn't carry Cal Trains.

Raulf: Could I ask this.. **inaudible** (coughing in the background)

Voice: 1400 pounds per linear foot would be the best specification that you could use.

Chair: Mr. Raulf excuse me, Mr. Raulf I believe your time is up..

Mr. Raulf: **Inaudible**....2500 pounds per square foot so if you want to use that standard , then that's the way you should be going, you should use 2500 pounds per foot if axle weight isn't the criteria you want to use.

Chair: Thank You, the last speaker is Paul **inaudible**, and I have probably mispronounced the last name. I'm Sorry

Paul: I am a city engineer in San Francisco the name of the company is **Inaudible**. How do you do ladies and gentlemen. Several people in San Francisco are ask me why do not CalTrans call for an international competition. Indeed why? Who can answer?

Chair: Thank you very much. That was our last speaker card. Other further discussions or questions from commissioners.

Voice: Well madam chair I wonder if you are going to address the request from San Francisco to make it's presentation for the Southern Alignment?

Chair: Would like to make a recommendation to staff on how that would be done or a motion?

Voice: I would like to make that as a request, if that needs a motion.

Chair: Okay Is there a discussion from staff or comments from commissioners with regards to that. Steve would you have an idea on how we could handle that?

Steve: The next regularly scheduled meetings of the engineering panel and your task force aren't until April so clearly it should occur before then. We would be happy to try to arrange a session as soon as your schedules allow, as the schedules of the three dozen people on E-Dap allow, It's going to be tough to pull it together but we will do our best and arrange it as quickly as possible.

Chair: Well I agree it should probably be a special meeting and not a task force meeting and we have to remember that everybody's schedules involved. I'm sure that Staff will do the best we can, we have been discussing an after conference at the conference in Washington DC so we will do the best we can and try to put that together, Angelo?

Angelo: I would love to hear that presentation but I wonder if we open up Pandora box for anybody who has got a valid or invalid proposal about alignment or design or anything else whether we in fact leave ourselves open to criticism if we hear from San Francisco, but not from Oakland, not from whoever, I think it would be a great presentation but I wonder if we are setting an improper precedent. I mean we have had a lot o public hearings, San Francisco initially supported the northern alignment, we heard from San Francisco in the 12th hour. I'm having a tough time today.

Chair: **Inaudible**, excuse me we have some commissioners that are trying to talk, thank you.

Voice: I agree, and in terms of your tone and the frustration because we have put a lot of time into this and sometimes people just disagree and I don't think it's proper to characterize that at least for us as being arrogant because we disagree with someone. But having said that I think San Francisco and the Navy are

obviously are important partners but not being able to hear their presentations would be worth the time for us to hear this presentation if it requires a special meeting I think we should go ahead and do that. But I don't want to raise expectations that this is going to be easy to do I think we should at least allow for San Francisco to do that and the Navy. So if that is a motion to so that Tom, I second it.

Chair: I, like Angelo, have some concerns with regards to who else is going to come up with planning and delay the process even more. At that particular time I would also like to have Contra Costa county here to be heard very strongly about how they feel about this. Other counties that have not been very involved in it so if I want to put some limits on this and say that hopefully this will be the last time we have to have one of these meetings. But I do plan on personally having somebody here from Contra Costa County to address some of our concerns we've tried to sit back and let the process go through, but if we want to do it this way we will do it this way also, so at this time I believe I have a motion on the floor and a second is there a second on the motion?

Chair: Okay motion carried, is there any other,

Voice: Just one more question most of what I heard from the Navy had to do with the most of what I thought was substitute from the Navy had to do with the adequacy or the EIR and the EIS. And maybe if, I'm not sure if that can be folded into the San Francisco presentation but I think we need to know about what is going on there.

Voice: We would be happy to provide that as well and Commissioner Brown on your point we will invite all stake holders as Dennis is fond of saying on this alignment, the only one that seems to make everyone happy is the current bridge and we can't build a new one on top of the old one..

Voice: I don't like the current bridge

Laughter

Voice: **inaudible.**

Chair: Yes Mr. Shay

Mr. Shay: I would like to make a point on the technical amendment of this motion, if we invite the Department of Navy joined with San Francisco to make that presentation is that acceptable.

Chair; Yes Yes that is part of the motion that I just passed.

Chair: Anything else from staff?

Voice: No Mam

Chair: What is the date of the next agendized meeting? Do we know that for sure.

Voice: Is that in April, Steve do you have the date. It says here in February. I think the calender you are seeing Commissioner is just reserving the room in case it is needed. The next regularly scheduled meeting, you are now a quarterly schedule in March the next meeting s April 14th.

Chair: And then we will pick a date and have to go with that date for the special meeting, I know I am not going to be able to please everybody. I hope everybody is aware of that, once a date is picked it stays. Okay anything else from any of the commissioner? Okay hearing none, seeing none, this meeting is adjourned. Thank You.

